

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

**DATE:** February 7, 2002

**PRESENT:** Doug Brown  
Paul Bauer  
Randall Gloege  
Mark Hardt  
Matt Redinger

Sandie Rietz  
George Madden  
Doxey Hatch  
Connie Landis

Cody McLees for Bryce Anderson (ex-officio)

Janie Park (ex-officio)

Dan Zirker (ex-officio)

**ABSENT:** David Gurchiek – *excused*  
Keith Edgerton – *excused*

George Benedict – *excused*

Bob Carr (ex-officio)  
Randy Rhine (ex-officio)  
Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)

Scott Harris (ex-officio)  
George White (ex-officio)  
Lee Peters (ex-officio)

**GUEST:** Joe Floyd

**PRESIDING:** Sandie Rietz, Chair

---

Sandie Rietz called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. on February 7, 2002 in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The January 31, 2002 meeting minutes were approved.

### I. OLD BUSINESS

**A. New Evaluation System, presented by Joe Floyd, Director, CATI Lab.** Joe Floyd explained the evolution of the evaluation process in the last few years. In the past, the faculty received a list of questions which they filled out and sent in. There was a very low response rate (less than 1/3 of the faculty) and of those responses, most were from a negative vocal minority. Also, after the evaluation was completed, the information stopped at the administrator's (person being evaluated) supervisor. In 1998, an effort to build a new evaluation system began. Committees made up of the administrator's

constituency were formed as a new way to evaluate an administrator. The focus is personal, face-to-face interviews between the committee members and the administrator, resulting in much less anonymity. Committee members will be responsible for what they say to the administrator. The committee members formulate their questions based on criteria set up by the administrator and the administrator's supervisor. After all the interviews are completed, the chair (and possibly co-chair) summarize the thoughts of the committee into a report. This report goes to the administrator and the administrator's supervisor. The administrator, in turn, must respond in some way (that is, as yet, undecided). One suggestion for a response was to have the administrator meet with the executive committees of the Faculty Association and the Academic Senate.

The people are selected to serve on a certain committee from a list of recommendations from the administrator being evaluated and her/his supervisor.

The question was raised whether the results of the committee are quantified in any way. Joe Floyd responded that the committee members will rate the administrator's answers on a scale (1-5 or 1-10, etc.) and also state *why* they feel the way they do. There are also many open-ended questions for the committee members to mention anything that may be missed by the questionnaire.

Confidentiality has been an issue. In one evaluation in the past, information was leaked by a member of the committee. However, names are never printed in the actual report. The only names that are known are in the actual interview (i.e. the administrator knows who she/he is speaking with). Those names are not written down anywhere.

The Senate asked if there was anything Dr. Floyd would like their help with. He responded that the committees right now are at 10-15 people each, and many faculty are unenthusiastic about joining the committees. He would ask that the Senators encourage faculty to sit on these committees.

## II. NEW BUSINESS

**A. Statement written by George Madden.** George Madden presented a new statement concerning revising the forms involved in catalog changes. He explained that in this new form, the faculty would be required to write in narrative form why the change is being made, and to sign this statement. This statement would then go to the UCC. If there was a problem found in the change, the UCC chair could appoint someone to go back to the originating department to resolve the problem. It was noted that Senate should set time limits if this situation were to occur, so that items don't get stuck in one committee or another. After the UCC clears up all problems, the item would be brought to Senate for approval. Dr. Madden also stated this is only a draft.

**B. Deadlines for the 2003-2005 Undergraduate Catalog.** It was stated by several Senate members that deadlines must be set now for the undergraduate catalog, so as to encourage departments to get moving on their changes now.

It was also suggested to have a catalog that spans several years (e.g. 2003-2007) and then create electronic addendums that would be burned on CDs.

**C. Practice of Submitting Items to the Board of Regents before submitting them to the Academic Senate, response from Janie Park, Provost.** Basically, it was a screw-up. The rules and guidelines for submission to the Board of Regents evidently have not been circulated to all faculty and departments, and are constantly in flux. Dr. Park will provide a list of what does and does not have to be approved by the Board of Regents.

It was suggested that a policy or guideline be established stating which items need Board approval. It was also suggested that a statement of whether the Board needs to be involved be added to all the forms the Senate uses, so it will be known by all who see/sign the form.

**D. Credit Transfer Committee.** The Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education is forming a committee on credit transferability in the state of Montana. The Academic Senate has been asked to send one representative. A representative will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

### III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

→ Discussion of the General Education Committee and their motion and resolution will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

→ The Writing Proficiency Committee wishes to create a portfolio course as a capstone writing course. Further discussion at the next Senate meeting.

→ **Senators are asked to formulate a list of items they would like included on an agenda for Geoff Gamble for the next Senate meeting.**

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

The next Senate meeting will be February 14, 2002 at the College of Technology.

rjr