Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting

Thursday, May 2, 2014
7:00-8:00 a.m.

Location: Kelley-Steward Room (Student Union Building)

MEETING MINUTES

Senators present:
Hugo Bertete-Aguirre, Laurie Battle, Tom Camm, Ronda Coguill, Chris Danielson (V. Chair), Bill Drury, Jerry Downey (Chair), Gretchen Geller, Bill Good, Scott Juskiewicz, Mary North Abbott, John Nugent, Vicki Petritz, Bill Ryan, Celia Schahczenski (Sec.), Jack Skinner, Rita Spear

Senators absent:
Sally Bardsley, Katie Hailer, Tim Kober, Chad Okrusch, James Rose, Glenn Shaw, Miriam Young

Vacant senate seats:
Electrical Engineering

Guests:
Doug Abbott (Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, VCAA)
Joe McClafferty (Vice Chancellor of Development and University Relations)
Michael Barth (Executive Director of the Foundation)
Larry Hunter (Senator elect for General Engineering)
Scott Rosenthal (Senator elect for Mining Engineering)
Sue Schrader (Senator elect for Petroleum Engineering)

Call to Order (7:00 a.m.): Jerry Downey, Chair

Roll Call: Celia Schahczenski, Secretary

I. Introduction of newly elected senators and guests

Downey announced the new senators for the 2014/2015 senate:

Bill Gleason is replacing Jerry Downey for Metallurgical and Materials Engineering
Larry Hunter is replacing Jack Skinner for General Engineering
Scott Rosenthal is replacing Tom Cam for Mining Engineering
Rick Rossi is replacing Laurie Battle for Mathematical Sciences
Sue Schrader is replacing Mary North-Abbott for Petroleum Engineering

II. Senate Business (7:05)

A. Review and approval of minutes from the 3-Apr-14 Senate meeting

Minutes approved unanimously with a spelling correction

B. April 3 Faculty Senate meeting with UM President Royce Engstrom

A number of senators attended. Downey presented the results of the Faculty Opinion & Satisfaction Survey. President Engstrom listened carefully and asked good questions. Overall it was a good session.

C. Faculty Opinion & Satisfaction Survey

- Results of the follow-up survey (completed April 29)

  The survey was issued and completed earlier this week. Each question had two parts: "Importance of this issue" and "Opinion on this issue". The distribution list for the survey was the same as it was for the previous survey. Result averages were calculated as before. In general the issues were seen as important (most above 4.0, with three questions above 3.6) and opinions ranging from 3.72 to 2.54.

- Discussion of path forward

  For the previous survey numerical results were placed onto the website early and abbreviated comments added later. It was suggested that while results from group 1 indicate that there is generally less satisfaction in the areas addressed by the survey than there is in group 2; the difference isn't significant enough to warrant the added confusion inherent in reporting multiple results. It was also suggested that, since this survey stated up front that the results might be published, and since the comments for the most part seemed to be attempts to identify problems and suggest solutions, the comments be published with only minor changes.

  With some discussion an ad-hoc Senate subcommittee was created to "sanitize" the comments. Once the committee has finished this process, the Senate will vote electronically whether to publish the "sanitized" comments.

III. Topics for Senate Consideration (7:20)

Proposed Revision of Student Course Evaluation Questions (with ASMT)

Downey thanked ASMT and senators who sent comments on revising the evaluation form. The resulting proposed feedback form was test trialed on students in Downey's department and overall the students were very enthusiastic about the proposed form.

Discussion:

- Students have been complaining about the length of the evaluation form and this one is much shorter
- Students would like to be given the evaluation forms earlier, maybe a few weeks before finals when the students have more time
- Doing the evaluation on-line would be helpful but the submission rate is often low for on-line evaluations. In the master's program, Engineering Management, students can't see their final grades until they complete the evaluation.
- How will the Student Release Questions be disseminated?
- It was suggested to remove the word "extra" from questions 5.
- It was suggested that question 3 of the written comments be changed to: "Other comments or suggestions? I f you responded 'strongly agree' or 'strongly disagree' to any of the questions, please elaborate."
- It was suggested that questions 7 in the Student Release Questions, be changed to "Make effective use of course material" since there are so many types of course materials.

While the question of how the Student Release Questions will be disseminated is still outstanding, it was moved and seconded that the Senate put endorsement of this new evaluation feedback form to an electronic vote.

IV. Summary of Academic Items for upcoming Electronic Vote (7:30)

A. Professor Emeritus status for Dr. William B. MacGregor

B. Curriculum Review Committee Recommendations

C. List of May 2014 Graduates

Granting Professor Emeritus status to Dr. Neil Wahl is also proposed.

The Senate agreed to put each of the above issues, including the Neil Wahl emeritus proposal to an electronic vote.

V. Presentation by Joe McClafferty, Vice Chancellor of Development and University Relations (7:35)

McClafferty described four ways that the Tech Foundation gets money:

1. State revenue which amounts to $15,000,000
2. Student tuition, fees, dining services, etc. which amounts to another $15,000,000
3. Research
4. Philanthropy

McClafferty stated that Tech can continue only getting funds from the first two sources, but that to advance we need more funds from the latter two sources.

People sometimes wonder how the Foundation decides who to work with. McClafferty stated that two things are needed:

- Some type of programming
- Engaged alumni who want to support whatever the programming is

For example, the Bob Green field had lots of enthusiastic support. The Foundation is interested in any programming ideas that people want to pursue. McClafferty warned that faculty members want to be compensated better but supporters aren't that interested in the endowed chairs being proposed

in the Faculty Excellent fund. Faculty need to be involved in gaining support. Ask for 3-5 million dollars for an endowed chair doesn't work without more ideas on how to package this program more creatively.

McClafferty suggested that scholarships are not being used enough for recruiting. Often they are helping students who are already at Tech. Supporters would like to see scholarships used as carrots to get more students to come to Tech.

McClafferty urged faculty members to come up with an initiative, and then think of ways to get it funded. The funding needs to be tested. For example, the idea of a Living and Learning Lab was brought up to people and it seems that people like the idea of supporting a Living and Learning Lab.

McClafferty stated that the Foundation door is open. The Foundation needs to have ideas bubble up from the faculty. They don't know how to make the departments or our product better. They do see that alumni want more of what we are already giving them. Alumni want more of what we produce.

Question:

- There is a Biology scholarship with rather strict criteria making it difficult for the Biology Department to get students to apply. McClafferty stated that they try to make scholarship funding be more general so this problem doesn't arise.

The Foundation wants to be more communicative with faculty. They are developing a newsletter. In that newsletter they will discuss big gifts from alumni and industry which were recently received.

Election of 2014/2015 Senate Officers

It was suggested to elect next year's officers before the end of the school year so the new officers would have the summer to get acclimated.

Downey reported that there used to be release time offered to the president of the Senate. Release time was available when Mark Sholes stepped down as president but wasn't used when Rod James stepped in. When Downey stepped in maybe release time was available but he wasn't aware of it. Release time is important for the Senate president and senators stated that they would work towards it.

Schahczenski will email a request for nomination of officers and an election will be held via electronic ballot.

VI. Adjournment (7:55)

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 a.m.