

Faculty Senate Agenda

2/16/24

4-5 p.m.

Mill 201

- I. Welcome and minutes
 - a. Review of 2/2/24 minutes

Action Items

- II. CRC (Reserved)

Informational Items

- III. Provost Search
 - a. March 1st closing date, nominations are anonymous.
 - b. March 25th – April 5th Campus Interview
- IV. Professional Development Group potential topics for the spring:
 - a. “Leadership, teamwork and more”
 - b. Dealing with challenging conversations and environments
 - c. “Butte Silver Bow Economic Development Outlook”

Discussion Items

- V. Request for faculty volunteers on the Policy Index
- VI. Safety Training
- VII. Course Evaluation Recommendations
- VIII. Research Faculty and Staff Policy
- IX. For the Good of the Order

Faculty Senate Minutes
2/2/24
Noon-1 p.m.
Mill 201

Senators in attendance: S. Risser, D. Autenrieth, C. Young, C. Faught, M. Haynes, A. Traut, A. Mitra, D. Galarus, L. Buckley, J. Kirtley, R. Nagisetty, R. LaDouceur, G. Wallace, S. Juskiewicz, G. Wyss, C. Gammons

- I. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. That motion was seconded and approved.

Action Items

- II. Nominations for the faculty representative to the Montana Tech Alumni Association was discussed. Lorri Birkenbuel was nominated. That nomination was seconded and passed without further discussion.

Informational Items

- III. Faculty/staff turnover was discussed and an update was provided.
- IV. The Research Faculty and Staff interim policy was discussed. Senators will bring the policy draft back to departments for discussion.

Discussion Items

- V. A proposal to revise the course evaluations and evaluation process was discussed. Senators are taking this proposal back to their departments and they are asked to send feedback to mhaynes1@mtech.edu
- VI. Safety training and safety committee were not discussed.
- VII. For the good of the Order – Faculty Senate was asked to inquire with their respective departments to see if any faculty are interested in reviewing the new policy on policies to ensure completeness.

	Lecture Course	Laboratory course	Distance course (fully online)	Distance course (blended)	Distance course (hyflex)
prepared.	1	1	1?	1?	1?
es general concepts and ideas.	4	1?	1?	1?	1?
xamples and illustrations.	1		3	4	4
ferences for more interesting and involved points.	8	8	7	8	8
ns clearly.	1	1	1?	1?	1?
ectures that are easy to outline.					
the objectives of each class.	2	2	2	2	2
arizes to emphasize the major points.	3	4			
a few major points during lecture rather than many.					
ies what he or she considers important for the purposes of testing and evaluation.	3	4	3	3	3
ams and various assignments effectively for synthesis and evaluation.	3	4	3?	3?	3?
and impartial in grading assignments, exams, quizzes, etc.	4	4			
students informed of their progress.					
ful and responsive to students.	5	5	5	6,7	6,7
rages class discussions/participation.	8	8	8	8	8
uestions of students.	8	8			
ng to listen to student questions and opinions.	5	5	5	5	5
nable for extra help during his/her office hours or by appointment.	5	5	6,8	7,9	7,9
concern for the quality of teaching and learning.	8	8			
rages students to challenge themselves and do high quality work.	8	8			
students with respect.					
effective style of presentation.	1	1	1?	1?	1?
strong command of the subject matter.	1	1	1?	1?	1?
nusiastic.					
ng was very effective in contributing to my learning.	1	1			

Policy Index – Faculty Needed

Les has formally approved 200.1 Formulation and Issuance of University Policies with the amendments that you suggested, and a couple others. It can be found here: www.mtech.edu/policies. Now comes the harder work of populating the Index. As you see in the policy, the date for having the Index fully updated is Dec 31, 2024. At that point, anything not found in the Index, will not be considered a University Policy.

We have moved some items from the Faculty Staff Handbook into the Index to show how this might look. However, nothing in there right now is final. We have some latitude through this year to make the move as painless as possible. I am asking you, via Faculty Senate, to appoint a couple of people to help with this navigation and help with communication back to Faculty Senate with questions and such.

For instance, we moved most of section 200 in the Handbook into section 300 in the index, as the BOR numbers academic items in the 300s, and that is now what the policy reads. However, in hindsight, I'm wondering if it might not be better to keep all the numbers in the Handbook, but add 300 before them. So instead of making 205 Evaluation, Tenure, Promotion and Merit – North Campus Faculty, 305 in the index, it would be 300.205 in the index. This might make it easier to update references to these policies that are found elsewhere, and would make it easier when moving policies from other sections in the handbook, into the index. These are the kind of questions I'd like to have a small – maybe 2 or 3 – group of faculty to help me think through. I do suspect there will be a decent time commitment with this – in the next couple months as we make decisions (maybe an hour a week – email/zoom or in person), and then pretty small through the end of the year. Once some of the key decisions are made, it would likely just be some emailing back and forth for the most part – and then reporting back to the Senate with updates and any concerns.

Safety Training

I would like to add to the Feb 2 meeting agenda:

1. MT Tech provides (pays for) and requires red cross first aid and cpr training for lab teaching assistants and research assistants (both grad and undergrad), security personnel, and allows for faculty and staff to take the training and obtain the certifications at MT Tech expense and during work hours. We did this in the past. It's a liability issue. We also should have training on policy for calling 9-1-1 etc. in an emergency.

We did this when Marilyn Cameron was safety director but I don't see it in policy. I've witnessed multiple lab medical emergencies here including a seizure and an almost amputation. I remember telling my two TAs, "you, call 9-1-1," and the other "you, call Marilyn Cameron." And being asked in response, "how do I call 9-1-1?" Until you've been in a crisis you don't appreciate how surreal it can be.

Below can happen here.

<https://safe.engineering.asu.edu/patrick-harran-timeline>

We should also consider hazops and similar to avoid this sort of situation...

To: Scott Risser, Faculty Senate Chair
From: Courtney Young, Course Evaluation Ad Hoc Committee Chair
Cc: Faculty Representatives (Dr. Kathryn Fitzgerald-McCormick, Dr. Matthew Haynes, Dr. Mario Caccia; Mr. Matthew Egloff
Student Representatives (Mr. Quin Costin and Mr. Jacob Huston)
Dr. Michele Hardy, Provost
Date: January 26, 2024

Attached are 6 documents. The first is a definition of the various course types (i.e., modalities) offered at MT Tech. These are edited versions of what the BofR uses. The other 5 documents are the committee's recommendations to revise the course evaluations for the different modalities. For the most part, we are recommending the Q's be more pertinent to the current times thus reducing the number from 25 to 8-9 depending on the modality. However, the 8-9 Q's are the direct feedback to the instructor. We are also recommending there be 4-5 Q's also depending on the modality but in regards to the student. Likewise, we strongly recommend that the comment section follow the principles of SGID midterm assessment. Furthermore, we also strongly recommend the Course Objectives and Outcomes be evaluated at the same time for all modalities but note that this will be cumbersome due to courses having different Objectives and Outcomes as well as numbers. When it comes to the three distance course modalities, we additionally recommend that the course design (layout) be evaluated as well but, at this time, not for the face to face lecture and lab courses.

We also have other recommendations and talking points in order to implement these new course evaluations:

1. Using Qualtrics or perhaps Etrieve – the scantron will no longer be used and becomes available for other purposes. We suggest Qualtrics because it appears to be superior for data analysis but both should be free albeit we did not confirm that. IT will need to be trained.
2. Requiring students to do the evaluations (with integrity) in order to get their grades – We suggest it be done on the last day of classes and not during finals. We acknowledge that there could be abuse with angry students as well as a potential for lawsuits.
3. Determining if the evaluations should be included in Student Handbook (along with statements of importance) – We look forward to hearing from ASMT on this matter. All students need to understand the importance of course evaluations. It will be good to review at Student Orientation and have available on website. Once approved, a presentation to ASMT will be needed.
4. Reviewing Course Objectives and Outcomes – Dr. Kathryn Fitzgerald-McCormick is willing to make herself available as needed to all faculty to look at perhaps change wording of their Objectives and Outcomes.
5. Having students sign the syllabi of all courses they take (it's a contract?) – We do disagree about this being a contract. Perhaps a statement could be used: "By signing the course syllabus, I am indicating that I have read and understand the information and requirements stated in this syllabus."
6. Mapping the old survey to the new surveys – This is being done by one of our committee members and will be made available next week.

Because course evaluations are a form of Faculty Mentoring, we have decided to address this as well. It is our view that this factor is a major issue with faculty retention.

1. Assessing instruction effectively – Course evaluations are biased and must not be weaponized. Instructional assessment should not depend solely on course evaluations. In fact, course evaluations should be used predominantly for instructional improvement.
2. Using SGID as a midterm requirement – All junior (nontenured) faculty should be required to have all of their courses each semester be evaluated. Doing them the same way as the (post)course evaluations will provide valuable feedback to the instructors.
3. Assigning faculty mentors – All junior (nontenured) faculty should be appointed a senior faculty member as a mentor. It needs to be done strategically to avoid conflict. The faculty mentor could be in another department and may even be emeritus or a Dept Head.
4. Using other strategies – Certainly there are other methods that could be employed including but not limited to assigning faculty lower teaching loads at least early on and assigning them classes they have expertise in if at all possible.

There will be a huge impact on not only implementing these course evaluations but also on Dept Standards as well as Promotion and Tenure, not to mention the significance to accreditation, both ABET and the upcoming NWCCU. We therefore recommend that the Faculty Senate have all members, as department representatives, go back to their respective departments for discussion and approval. For this reason, Provost Michele Hardy is also copied in so she can also start giving the committee feedback.

Courtney Young, M&ME Representative and
Course Evaluation Ad Hoc Committee Chair

1. Course Modality Definitions

- a. *Face to Face* (F2F) delivery is a course designed for fully in-person synchronous attendance, with at least 80% (or more) of the scheduled course time occurring within a physical classroom and/or laboratory. Coursework and resources may be available via the campus's Learning Management System (LMS).
- b. *Internet or Online* delivery means that 100% of the course section is offered completely and asynchronously via the campus's LMS with no F2F interaction required between instructors and students.
- c. *Synchronous Remote* delivery is characterized by a course offered through scheduled (synchronous) interactive video. A course delivered through synchronous remote delivery may have a F2F classroom location where students may choose to attend.
- d. *Blended* delivery is designed specifically to be delivered partially online in an asynchronous format and partially through F2F interaction, typically in a classroom. Both online and F2F interactions are required for the course with 20-80% offered online. This delivery is characterized by the expectation of reduced F2F class meeting time when compared to the equivalent credit classroom course.
- e. *Limited On-Site* delivery is characterized by a course section wherein 80% or more (but not all) of the course is delivered online in an asynchronous format. Course requirements not provided through online delivery must only require concentrated, short-term in-person experiences including but not limited to, for example, internship, clinical, and practicum experiences that may be completed near a student's location.
- f. *Hybrid-Flexible or "Hyflex"* delivery is any course where students may choose to attend either in an assigned F2F classroom environment or in an asynchronous online environment (remote synchronous may also be available but is not required).

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Face to Face Lecture Courses

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

- a. Was this course required for your major or was it an elective? Required Elective
b. What grade do you expect in this course? F D C B A
c. How much time did you spend on this course outside of class? _____ hrs/wk
d. How much outside time involved the instructor (office hours/appointment)? _____ hrs/wk

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1. was prepared for lecture and maintained effective teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. provided and reviewed a syllabus that included course objectives and outcomes (see below).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. used various assignments, quizzes and/or exams effectively for evaluation and synthesis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. used fair evaluation and synthesis methods.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. gave timely feedback that helped students prepare for future assignments, quizzes and/or exams.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. used lecture time efficiently.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. encouraged students to challenge themselves and produce quality work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Please provide additional comments.

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Face to Face Lecture Courses

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Objective #1: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Objective #2: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Objectives as needed

Course Outcomes – Please indicate if the following outcomes were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Outcome #1: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Outcome #2: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Outcomes as needed

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Face to Face Laboratory Courses

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

- a. Was this course required for your major or was it an elective? Required Elective
b. What grade do you expect in this course? F D C B A
c. How much time did you spend on this course outside of class? _____ hrs/wk
d. How much outside time involved the instructor (office hours/appointment)? _____ hrs/wk

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1. was prepared for lab and included explanations for safety and health issues as applicable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. provided and reviewed a syllabus that included course objectives and outcomes (see below).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. offered hands-on labs unless equipment was delicate, expensive and/or solely available.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. used fair evaluation and synthesis methods.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve future reports.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. offered labs that complemented the lectures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. encouraged students to challenge themselves and produce quality work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Please provide additional comments.

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Face to Face Laboratory Courses

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Objective #1: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Objective #2: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Objectives as needed

Course Outcomes – Please indicate if the following outcomes were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Outcome #1: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Outcome #2: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Outcomes as needed

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

- | | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| a. Was this course required for your major or was it an elective? | Required | Elective |
| b. What grade do you expect in this course? | F D C | B A |
| c. How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class and independently)? | _____ | hrs/wk |
| d. Did you take advantage of the instructor's online office hours? | Yes | No |
| e. Did you find the flexibility of a fully-online schedule useful? | Yes | No |

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1. provided clear directions for course exercises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. was present for online discussions and interactions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Design

1. was effectively and logically organized.	<input type="radio"/>				
2. provided a fully-online schedule resulting in a seamless experience.	<input type="radio"/>				
3. had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other.	<input type="radio"/>				
4. offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, Apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>				
5. provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course.	<input type="radio"/>				

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Please provide additional comments.

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (fully-online)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Objective #1: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Objective #2: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Objectives as needed

Course Outcomes – Please indicate if the following outcomes were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Outcome #1: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Outcome #2: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Outcomes as needed

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (Hyflex)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| a. Was this course required for your major or was it an elective? | Required | Elective |
| b. What grade do you expect in this course? | F D C | B A |
| c. How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class, online, and independently)? | _____ | hrs/wk |
| d. Did you take advantage of the instructor's office hours? | Yes | No |
| e. Did you find the flexibility of a Hyflex schedule useful? | Yes | No |

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1. provided clear information regarding the online and face-to-face schedules and requirements as well as flexibility between the two designs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. provided clear directions for course exercises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. was present for online discussions and interactions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (Hyflex)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Design

- | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. was effectively and logically organized. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. provided a Hyflex schedule resulting in a seamless experience. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.). | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course. | <input type="radio"/> |

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Please provide additional comments.

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (Hyflex)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Objective #1: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Objective #2: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Objectives as needed

Course Outcomes – Please indicate if the following outcomes were met or not met and comment

The student will:

Course Outcome #1: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Outcome #2: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Outcomes as needed

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Student

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| a. Was this course required for your major or was it an elective? | Required | Elective |
| b. What grade do you expect in this course? | F D C | B A |
| c. How much time did you spend on this course (including in-class, online, and independently)? | _____ | hrs/wk |
| d. Did you take advantage of the instructor's office hours? | Yes | No |
| e. Did you find the flexibility of a blended schedule useful? | Yes | No |

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Instructor

	1 = Strongly disagree	2 = Disagree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	4 = Agree	5 = Strongly agree
1. provided clear information regarding the online and face-to-face schedule and requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. provided clearly stated course objectives and outcomes in a syllabus or other location (see below).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. provided clear directions for course exercises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. provided access to resources needed to complete the course work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. articulated clearly the expected standards of performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. gave timely feedback that helped students prepare and improve.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. was responsive and available during office hours or by appointment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. provided opportunities for interaction with the content, other learners, and/or the instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. was present for online discussions and interactions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Design

- | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. was effectively and logically organized. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. provided a blended schedule resulting in a seamless experience. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. had assignments and lectures that were useful and complemented each other. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. offered clear instructions for accessing course materials (including manuals, handouts, apps and tools, audio or video recordings, etc.). | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. provided opportunities for low-stakes assessment such as self-evaluation to measure learning (formative assessment) throughout the course. | <input type="radio"/> |

Comments

What course aspects contributed to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What course aspects did not contribute to your learning (and meeting course objectives and outcomes)?

What do you suggest for improving the course?

Feedback for other students: What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course (or section)?

Please provide additional comments.

MONTANA TECH

Evaluation for Distance Courses (blended)

<CRN, Dept, Course Number, Course Name, Semester, Year, Instructor>

Course Evaluations are routinely used so courses and labs can be adjusted based on your input. Both positive comments and constructive criticism are welcome. It is important to note that your input is used by the instructors to improve all courses and labs and thereby help future students taking them. This evaluation will not be seen by the instructor until after the course is completed and grades are submitted.

Course Objectives – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment.

The student will:

Course Objective #1: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Objective #2: _____ <type in the objective here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Objectives as needed

Course Outcomes – Please indicate if the following objectives were met or not met and comment.

The student will:

Course Outcome #1: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Course Outcome #2: _____ <type in the outcome here> _____

Met Not Met

Comments _____

Add more Course Outcomes as needed

Montana Technological University

Research Faculty & Research Staff (Interim Policy)

Subject:

Section 400 – Research and Public Service

Policy Number:

400.1

Revised date:

November 15, 2023

Review date:

May 15, 2024

Responsible Party:

Vice Chancellor of Research

Historical versions: 2007, signed by Chancellor Gilmore.

Introduction and Purpose:

Research staff positions are classified into three categories: 1) Research Faculty; 2) Center Directors, and 3) Other Research Professionals (e.g. Post-Doctoral Research Associates, Research Scientist, Research Engineer).

Authority:

The Vice Chancellor of Research is responsible for maintaining this policy.

University Policy:

Research Faculty: The non-tenurable Research Faculty positions are: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, and Distinguished Research Professor. Individuals holding Research Faculty positions, encompassing four distinct classifications, are assigned to a host department within either the Lance College of Mines and Engineering or the College of Letters, Sciences, and Professional Studies. In this capacity, they adhere to the established departmental standards of the host department with allowances for the enhanced research and reduced instructional requirements, and work under the direction of the sponsoring faculty researcher (Principal Investigator, PI) and Department Head.

Their duties, performance, and responsibilities are also subject to general oversight by the college Dean and the Provost to ensure alignment with the academic and research objectives of the respective college. When institutional needs and goals allow, Research Faculty may be assigned to teach a maximum of six credits hours per year.

The Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) role in oversight to ensure that individuals' research activities are consistent with the policies of the Office of Sponsored Research and the terms of applicable sponsored research agreements. The VCR's oversight ensures that these standards are maintained, working collaboratively with the Deans and the Provost to foster a thriving academic and research environment.

University Research Center Directors: University Research Centers at Montana Tech are established by Board of Regents (BOR) [Policy 218 - Institutional Organization \(mus.edu\)](#), and are recognized institutional organizations, as listed on [BOR Policy 218.5 \(mus.edu\)](#). Establishment of new University Research centers must undergo both campus and BOR review, per Policy 218. University Research Center Directors report to the Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR), with the VCR serving as hiring authority. In the appointment of a Center Director, the VCR will consult other campus constituents and the Chancellor; the Provost will approve appointments that involve tenure-track or research faculty.

Other Research Personnel: Montana Tech will employ, as needed, research personnel on contract work funded by state, federal, and private agencies. These contracts will be limited term, non-tenured, and subject to renewal based on the continued availability of funding. The Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR), and Director of Sponsored Programs are signatories on these appointments. Research personnel will generally not have teaching or advising responsibilities within the scope of their contract, unless approval is obtained following the procedures corresponding to this policy. Research Personnel will be assigned to a host department within (a) the Lance College of Mines and Engineering, (b) the College of Letters, Sciences, and Professional Studies, or (c) BOR approved research center listed in [Policy 218 - Institutional Organization \(mus.edu\)](#). Students enrolled in greater than a half-time credit load in their degree program are ineligible for these positions, but may be eligible for other forms of student employment.

Internal control: This interim policy has been reviewed by UM legal.



Adopted by: (Chancellor)

12/11/2023

Date

Procedures:

Category 1: Research Faculty

General requirements for each Research Faculty position are described below.

Research Assistant Professors are, upon entry, required to hold an earned Ph.D. in a relevant technical field and have authored at least three peer-reviewed publications, which may include conference proceedings, book contributions, journal articles, or patents. Further, they must have experience as an author or co-author of grant proposals, have served as an advisor or mentor to B.S., M.S., or Ph.D. students, and have taught at least three credits of upper-level or graduate-level courses.

Research Associate Professors appointment to the role of Associate Research Professor requires four years of prior experience as an Assistant Research Professor or equivalent, along with demonstrated research achievements, as gauged by peer evaluation. Typical research achievements expected for this rank include peer-reviewed publications, grant writing, a demonstrated funding record as PI or co-PI, mentoring of junior researchers and/or students, and active service to the profession. The typical publication record will be established by the host department, per their department standards..

Research Professors will typically have held the position of Associate Research Professor for five years (or equivalent for external candidates), with a cumulative publication and service record that has led to national prominence. Specific numbers of cumulative publications should be further specified by departmental standards. Demonstrated mentorship of Ph.D. students or postdoctoral researchers is required. Research Professors will typically act as PI on grants or contracts that fully secure their annual salary coverage, along with additional research support personnel.

Distinguished Research Professors are individuals with a terminal degree and a distinguished track record of publication, external funding, service, and mentorship. This position is typically reserved for exceptional candidates, after nomination by the Dean's Council and approval by the Chancellor. The Dean's Council will establish benchmarks for this position. The ability to generate externally funded research projects that fully fund their salary is expected.

Salaries: Research faculty members on non-tenurable appointments can receive salary increases and promotions on the basis of assigned activity consistent with the requirements of Unit Standards, and contingent upon available funding. Such increases cannot come from the pools established by the CBA for regular faculty. Any recommended salary increase beyond the salary floors requires approval and the identification of funding by the Dean, the VCR, and/or the Provost.

Appointment Level: The majority (>0.6 FTE) of the salary of research faculty should be covered by awarded grants, for which the candidate may or may not

serve as PI. If the FTE salary threshold defined in the letter of appointment is not achieved, employment may be terminated and the individual must apply for reinstatement. Part-time appointments may also be considered. On a case-by-case basis, research faculty may explore with the Vice Chancellor of Research various means to sustain funding in the event of a funding gap or fluctuation in funding levels.

Teaching: When applicable the teaching duties will be specified in the annual contract, at the individual's base salary.

Category 2: University Research Center Directors

Scope: Per BOR policy, Research Centers and Institutes differ from one another in focus, scope, and staffing, but each contributes in unique ways to the common goals of expanding knowledge, generating new discoveries and/or having a positive impact on society through informing policy and systemic change. Communities of researchers and staff in Research Centers and Institutes provide a stimulating environment that encourages early researchers and challenges experienced researchers. Research Centers and Institutes also contribute to the education and training of the researchers of the future by serving as learning environments for students. Interdisciplinary collaboration is promoted by Research Centers and Institutes both within the Institution and among MUS Institutions. Research Centers and Institutes do not provide didactic coursework, confer academic degrees or academic certificates or require accreditation by external accrediting bodies. Research Centers and Institutes are intended to provide a portal for obtaining external funding in response to federal and/or state research priorities. At Montana Tech, these University centers were established as interdisciplinary entities with research themes that span academic units and colleges. As multidisciplinary research entities, they typically do not fall within the purview of a single department or program. At Montana Tech, oversight of Center Directors' performance and research activities is conducted by the VCR in collaboration with Deans and the Provost to ensure the leadership, research, and operational activities of the centers align with the institution's goals and maintain compliance with relevant policies and agreements.

Hiring and Oversight: When full-time, these positions will be advertised and competitively filled through the normal recruitment process, as defined by MUS Human Resources. When filled as partial appointments by existing faculty or staff, these positions will follow the University buyout policy, in consultation with MTFAs guidelines for partial appointments. Center Directors are selected based on their demonstrated track record of experience in research, education, service, or outreach management that showcases effective leadership aligning with the dedicated center's success and financial sustainability. Center Directors may be appointed from tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, research staff, or through an external search process, with the VCR as the hiring authority. Co- or joint appointments that involve faculty lines (both tenure-track and research

faculty) require approval by the Provost. The flexibility allows for the appointment of individuals with diverse backgrounds and expertise to lead our centers.

Salaries: Research faculty members on non-tenurable appointments can receive salary increases and promotions on the basis of assigned activity consistent with the requirements of Unit Standards, and contingent upon available funding. Such increases cannot come from the pools established by the CBA for regular faculty. Any recommended salary increase beyond the salary floors requires approval and the identification of funding by the Dean, the VCR, and when impacting faculty lines, the Provost.

Category 3: Other Research Personnel

Research Personnel are involved in externally funded research activities and may be assigned to handle administrative and/or or technical aspects of research projects. Their roles can be diverse, covering areas such as project management, data analysis, laboratory management, and more. Research professionals are generally on continuing contracts, subject to the continued availability of funding. Appointments are typically on an annual or biannual basis, and aligned with external research contracts.

Placement in Research Personnel positions is based on experience, degree, and research accomplishments, and is done in consultation with both peer evaluation of scholarly achievements, with collaborative oversight by the Vice Chancellor of Research and Provost. These positions will be advertised and competitively filled through the normal recruitment process. Examples of specific roles for Research Personnel are:

Post-Doctoral Research Scholar: Post-Doctoral Research Scholar must possess a Doctorate in a field relevant to the requirements of the contract. Research Scholar, or "post-doc", positions provide opportunities for individuals to gain research experience by actively contributing to ongoing externally funded research projects. Thus, Post-Doctoral Research Scholar positions are generally considered an entry-level position and extension of graduate education, and are typically reserved for researchers with 0-4 years of experience after the doctorate. Research Scholars engage in research activities that include conducting research, publishing, and collaborating with other researchers.

Research Professionals (including Research Scientist, Research Engineer, Laboratory Manager): Research Professionals shall possess a Bachelor's or Master's or Doctorate degree in a field relevant to the requirements of the contract. Research Professionals may have diverse educational backgrounds; individuals holding PhDs in relevant fields are preferred but candidates with bachelor's or master's degrees and a high level of relevant experience in the field may be considered.

To ensure these professionals have the opportunity for professional development and advancement, Research Scientist and Research Engineers are further classified

into rank, as follows: Research Scientist I, Research Scientist II, Research Scientist III, and in parallel, Research Engineer I, Research Engineer II, Research Engineer III. Level I corresponds to an entry-level position. Typically, a Research Engineer will hold a Professional Engineer license, differentiating this position from the Research Scientist.

Oversight: Research Personnel work under the direction of the sponsoring faculty researcher (Principal Investigator, PI), and either the Department Head or the Center Director. Their duties, performance, and responsibilities are also subject to general oversight by the respective Dean to ensure alignment with the objectives of the respective college or center.

Promotion and Advancement: Research Staff will be placed in rank based on peer and department/college review of research accomplishments, recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Research, who will then review comparable positions as well as institutional history. The criteria for promotion are to be established by the hosting department/unit, with review by the Vice Chancellor for Research. As professionals and valued members of the community, Research Professionals receive annual evaluations in a manner consistent with other members of their unit. Salary bands for each rank/position will be established by the Executive Leadership Team of the University, based on degree, professional licensure, qualifications, research achievement, and years of experience.

Teaching Duties: When it benefits the interests of the campus and host department, Research Scholars and Professionals may teach courses for compensation paid at the prevailing campus rate through an Extra Compensation Agreement. The arrangement is subject to administration approval, including the host Department Head, Dean, and Provost. In addition, Research Personnel on external contracts must have their teaching duties approved by the PI, the Director of Sponsored Programs, and the VCR. Research Scholars and Professionals may advise graduate students if and only if they have sought status as Affiliate Faculty, per that procedure. Research Scholars and Professionals may serve on graduate committees with approval by the Dean of the Graduate School, as noted in the Graduate Student Handbook.